

Appln. No. Serial No. 09/786,138
Amtdt. Dated 4/24/06
Second Response in Appln, Reply to Office Action of 11/22/2005
Page 9 of 10

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 101. The specification and Claims 1 and 2 have been amended in the foregoing amendment.

Claims 1-3 Are Statutory Subject Matter

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the Examiner alleged that Claims 1-3 merely recite a mathematical algorithm, per se. Applicants amended Claim 1 to clarify that the claimed subject matter is statutory. The method of Claim 1 is implemented on a computer and results in the compression of a bit string. Applicants also amended Claims 1 and 2 and the specification to clarify the invention.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On February 10, 2006, a telephone interview was held among Examiner Huyen X. Vo, Yumi Inagaki and the undersigned. During the interview, the Examiner proposed amending Claim 1 to clarify the information being compressed. Applicants amended independent Claim 1 to include such a step.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing is submitted as a complete response to the Office Action identified above. This application should now be in condition for allowance, and the Applicants solicit

Appln. No. Serial No. 09/786,138
Amtd. Dated 4/24/06
Second Response in Appln, Reply to Office Action of 11/22/2005
Page 10 of 10

a notice to that effect. If there are any issues that can be addressed via telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the undersigned at 404.685.6799.

Respectfully submitted,



By: Brenda O. Holmes
Reg. No. 40,339

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530
Telephone: (404) 815-6500
Facsimile: (404) 815-6553
Our Docket: 44471/254367